2003-2004 *No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools Program* Cover Sheet

Name of Principal Mrs. Carole Hiltman
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Esparto Middle School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 26675 Plainfield St.
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Esparto CA 95627-2192
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (530) 787-4151 Fax (530) 787-3890

Website/URL www.espartok12.org/ms/ E-mail chiltman@espartok12.org

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent* Dr. Tom Michaelson
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Esparto Unified School District Tel. (530) 787-3446

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

Date
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson Mrs. Helen Voss
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this package, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

Date
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

**Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

[Include this page in the school's application as page 2.]

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)

2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2003-2004 school year.

3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.

4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 1998.

5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.

6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.

7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.

8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district:
   - 1 Elementary schools
   - 1 Middle schools
   - _____ Junior high schools
   - 1 High schools
   - 1 Other (Briefly explain) Continuation High School

   4 TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: $7605

   Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: $6719

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

   [ ] Urban or large central city
   [ ] Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
   [ ] Suburban
   [X] Small city or town in a rural area
   [ ] Rural

4. 5 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

   _____ If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
6	38	25	63
7	33	40	73
8	31	34	65
As reported October 1, 2003			
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →			201

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:

37.5 % White (not of Hispanic origin)
1 % Black or African American
59.5 % Hispanic or Latino
1 % Asian/Pacific Islander/Filipino
1 % American Indian/Alaskan Native
100% Total as of October 1, 2003 CBEDS Report

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 66 %

(This rate includes the total number of students who transferred to or from different schools between October 1 and the end of the school year, divided by the total number of students in the school as of October 1, multiplied by 100.)

(1)	Number of students who transferred ***to*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	76
(2)	Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	79
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	155
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	234
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.66
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	66

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 28.3 %
An additional 18.8% are EL students who have been redesigned (R-FEP)
57 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 1
Specify languages: Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 55 %

111 Total Number Students Who Qualify

If this doesn't produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families or the school doesn't participate in a federally-supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate

10. Students receiving special education services: 12.4 %
26 Total Number of Students Served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

____Autism	1 Orthopedic Impairment
____Deafness	____Other Health Impaired
____Deaf-Blindness	12 Specific Learning Disability
2 Hearing Impairment	9 Speech or Language Impairment
____Mental Retardation	____Traumatic Brain Injury
2 Multiple Disabilities	____Visual Impairment Including Blindness

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

Number of Staff

	Full-time	Part-Time
Administrator(s)	1	
Classroom teachers	10	1
Special resource teachers/specialists	1	
Paraprofessionals (aides)		2
Support staff (clerical)	1	1
Total number*	13	4

This is the # of on-site staff. This list does not include support staff that serves all schools in the district such as the psychologist, kitchen staff, and custodians. None of these positions are assigned only to EMS.

12. Average school student-"classroom teacher" ratio: 20:1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. (Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.)

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	2000-1999
Daily student attendance	97	96	95	95
Daily teacher attendance	97	97	96	95
Teacher turnover rate	9	24	37	23
Student dropout rate	0	0	0	0

Explanation of Teachers Turnover Rate:

1999-0 (3 teachers; 2 teachers transferred to our high school when a new principal was hired there and positions opened; 1 resigned & took a job closer to home)

2000-01 (4 teachers; 2 moved out of state; 1 transfer from SpEd to E/LA for us & after trying it decided to go back to special service in another district as we had no position. 1 part time teacher we shared with our high school took a high school head coaching job in another part of California)

2001-02 (3 teachers = 1 resigned; 1 took part-time job in district next to her house; 1 had multiple subject credential but was teaching science. No desire to get science authorization so moved to take elementary position in another district).

2002-03 (1 teacher relocated out of area with family)

Esparto Unified is in a somewhat remote area. There are many larger districts surrounding us where employees can work and not commute. Although housing is just starting to be built, affordable housing has been very difficult to find.

Part III - School Summary Narrative

Esparto Middle School, located 45 miles northwest of our state capital, is one of four schools in the 849-student Esparto Unified School District. Its 201, sixth through eighth graders (59% Hispanic/Latino;
37% white) reside primarily in Esparto and tiny, rural towns as far as 21 miles away. A substantial number of families live and depend upon the 550 square miles of agriculture land as their source of income, requiring them to work extended hours. Students often are left in charge of siblings, home, and their own education. Thirty-three percent or more are latch key kids. Thirty-three percent tell us they move two or three times within a year. Twenty-six percent of parents have only an 8th grade education; an additional 26% finished formal education at 12th grade. It is difficult for many students to get educational assistance at home. This way of life presents unique challenges to which the school community has, and must continue, to respond.

In 1998, a seed was planted—not in our fertile soil—but in the minds and hearts of our community. The seed sprouted into a new "plant" via a local school bond that moved EMS from the elementary site to a site next door. With tremendous growth on the horizon, EUSD's only middle school may relocate once again. Until then, EMS remains a "portable" campus, unable to serve many student needs on site. There is no multipurpose room, gym, nor building large enough to handle more than 40% of its students at one time. Although EMS houses adequate classroom space and a nice computer lab, students walk to EES to use a library or trek to EHS for athletic events and assemblies. Yet, the school offers an excellent PE program, exceptional shop class, and student academic progress soars.

EMS is a state finalist in the 2004 California "Schools to Watch" program and was the only middle school to be named a 2003 State Title 1 Achieving School as students in all subgroups more than doubled their academic growth in each of the last three years. This remarkable academic growth is attributed to quality parent and community support, wonderful students, effective leadership, dedicated staff, the ability to stay focused on our shared vision, united effort to develop goals, and collaborative energy to implement processes to attain goals regardless of extraordinary budget cuts, reduction in force, and limited facilities.

Our collective mission is ***to prepare ALL students to be life-long learners by providing an environment that motivates them to grow to their highest potential and become community-minded, responsible citizens. We believe ALL children can learn if we develop a partnership that is enriched by the diversity of our community and creates an atmosphere that supports the art and science of teaching and learning.*** Our school vision is ***for the entire middle school community to ensure that each student is given the opportunity to become a caring, contributing, responsible member of society, equipped with the skills and knowledge to meet future goals.*** Our guiding principles include the tenets of *"Taking Center Stage,"* our state's handbook for middle grades education.

Nowhere is our vision more evident than in our master and block schedules. Instruction is delivered via three daily 91-minute classes and a 45-minute activity period, which constitutes the daily A/B block schedule and exceeds the state-required 54,000 annual minutes of instructional time. "Block" enables EMS to provide: a) year-long math support for ALL students and reading support to every 6th grader; b) one trimester of reading support to every 7th grader and writing support to every 6th grader and all special education students; c) temporary pullout for Title 1 students in reading/language; and d) intense reading/language support for migrant and EL students **all within the regular school day without reducing core content instructional time**. **It allows all 8th graders to have math 91 minutes daily (M-TH) and 52 minutes on Fridays.** As a result, more students are meeting the higher state math expectations (all 8th grader taking algebra) as evidenced by a 23-percentile point jump (44 to 67th percentile) on the SAT9 and the number of students scoring above the 50th percentile increasing from 43-77% in 2002.

Besides regular school support, over 134 students are involved in after-school math, writing, language, and reading intervention classes. Students are expected to take responsibility for their

own learning by attending these classes and taking an active role to set goals and monitor their own progress. One way this is done is through our awarding winning Goals, Organization, Accountability and Learning System (G.O.A.L.S.) Each student analyzes his/her own achievement and test scores, sets goals, and then creates an action plan that is included in his/her own individual learning plan and shared with parents at an annual individual student-led conference **(only 1 student/parent has failed to attend in three years).** This is an example of what happens when we take joint responsibility for, and believe in, our students, and our students are taught to take responsibility and are led to believe in themselves. Our T.E.A.M (Together Everyone Achieves More), rich in its diverse population of loving children, interested parents, devoted staff, and dedicated community, has worked together to make EMS a "Great Place to Learn."

Part IV – Indicators of Academic Success - Meaning of the School's Assessment Results

Academic achievement at EMS is measured at the local, state, and national levels. All of our assessments indicate that the longer students attend EMS the greater they achieve. At the local level each student is assessed annually on school-based, criterion-referenced tests in reading, writing, and math. Annually 77% of the 6th graders enter EMS reading below grade level (52% two or more years and 33% three or more years below). At the end of the year (2002) 36.9% (2003), 38% of 6th graders were reading at grade level while at the end of the year (2002) 50.9% (2003) 54.8% of 8th graders were reading at grade level. In math the same results occur: 6th grade (2003) 26.1% (2003) 41% and 8th grade (2002) 67.3% (2003), 60%. We also measure achievement by the number of students enrolled in grade level and advanced classes. There are no remedial tracks or classes at EMS. Sixty percent of our 8th graders take Algebra 1A; 30% take Algebra 1 (as do 15% of our 7th graders); and 10% walk to EHS to take geometry. The California Standards Tests (CST) in English/language arts, math, and 8th grade history are used to measure how well students are achieving in relation to the state content standards. Students are rated in five categories from "advanced" to "far below basic." Once again the number of "proficient or advanced" students increases consistently from 6th to 8th grades. In 2002 the percentages were: Reading (6th 16%; 7th 30%; 8th 34%); Math (6th 16%; 7th 39%; 8th 46%) The total number of students proficient or advanced school wide then translated dramatically as well: for example in English/language arts (2001, 18%; 2002, 27%; 2003, 43%).

The national test in reading and math is a norm-referenced test called the California Achievement Test, or CAT6 (was SAT9 until 2003). We see parallel results. On the 2002 SAT9 tests the percent of students scoring above the 50th percentile; Reading (6th 35%; 7th 54%; 8th 67%) Math (6th 50%; 7th 60%; 8th 77%). Although the CAT6 scores decreased slightly due to the loss of a veteran math teacher in June and then the loss of his replacement the following December, the percent of students scoring above the 50th percentile from 2001 to 2002 jumped from 40-52% in reading and from 40 to 62% in math.

California uses both the CST and CAT6 to measure the annual performance and progress of each school, compare all schools, and compare "similar" schools. This information is reported as an API (Academic Performance Index score from 200-1000. EMS's API has grown 232 points in five years (487-566-620-707-729) lifting EMS from 100th on the similar school's list to second. In 2002, **EMS was the top secondary school and second top school in the state to make the most four-year API increase.** These test results indicated a 108-point API gain in the scores of our Hispanic students. 55% of the students are considered low income, which qualifies EMS as a socio-economically disadvantaged school. The students within this group gained 150 API points. Each subgroup (English learners, socio-economically disadvantaged, Hispanic, students with disabilities, etc.) has more than doubled their expected "growth target" in each of the last three years which gave EMS the distinction of being the **only middle school in California** to be recognized as a 2003 Title 1 Achieving School. Also, each subgroup has met the 2002 and 2003 annual target of the national No Child Left Behind requirement (all students must perform

at/above the proficient level on state standards-based assessment by 2014). To measure this each subgroup must meet an annual Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement. For elementary and middle schools this means at least 13.6% (reading) 16% (math) of students in every subgroup must score proficient. The EMS school AYP percents: Reading (2002) 30.2% (2003) 42.5%. Math (2002) 39.4% (2003) 39.5%. Equal percents and gains were made in all subgroups. For example, the socio-economically disadvantaged percent jumped in Reading (2002) 16.6% (2003) 27.9%; and Math (2002) 30.5% (2003) 35.8%.

These types of gains have been typical each year since 1999. For the first time in 2003, we had a slight dip in a testing area, yet the API gain was still 22 points, and the AYP results rose considerably. The 2003 test results showed a sharp increase in the percent of students scoring proficient on the state reading test, a slight increase in state math test, but a significant decrease in the CAT6 math test. Strangely, we found many students who scored "proficient/advanced" on state tests scored low on the "number sense" parts of the CAT6. This is offset by the fact that each year more EMS students are taking higher math level state tests such as Algebra 1 and Geometry (and doing well) instead of the state general Math 8 test. For example, in 2003 50% of the 8th graders taking the geometry test scored advanced and 50% scored proficient. Similarly, but with a little lesser success, this is seen on the Algebra 1 tests. California students take the state test that is equivalent to the math class they are expected to finish by year's end. So Algebra 1A students take the general Math 8 test and not the Algebra 1 test. We are happy to see more students taking the Algebra 1 and Geometry tests annually and less taking the general Math 8 test.

Indicators of Success - Use Assessment Data to Understand/Improve Student/School Performance.

Annually, both the School Site Council (SSC) and staff analyze data (CST, NRT, API, AYP, etc.) which is disaggregated by all subgroups (ethnicity, gender, Title 1, EL, G.A.T.E. socioeconomic status, etc.) SSC uses data to monitor student achievement, identify goals to include in the school's Single Site Plan for Student Achievement and evaluate school improvement efforts. The staff does the same but looks more closely at other assessments, attendance rates, student work, etc. to improve curriculum and instruction and help develop goals for school improvement. Together we work. When content cluster data showed students "below average" in math application and measurement skills, an exploratory wood-shop class emphasizing application of these skills became a Site Plan goal. It was added to our exploratory classes, and SSC funded materials for the class. Students sold their projects at the PTSA Auction. The context cluster results not only improved, but PTSA donated the proceeds back to the class to purchase tools and wood. When data showed 50% of students on the honor roll while 60% were reading below grade level and only 2% scoring in the top quartiles, we decided our grading system was giving faulty messages about student achievement so we implemented a standards-based report card. This resulted immediately more standards-based curriculum and instruction and more refined assessment tools for teachers. One math teacher explains, "I review the course of study, content standards, and previous assessments to determine curriculum and instruction. I teach and give standards-based quizzes/tests and review student journals, portfolios, and work samples to see what the support teacher and I need to do. I score all these things to measure each student's proficiency level and make further decisions about my instruction. I give and score my criterion-referenced test as a final assessment and then record the student's standard proficiency on the report card." E/LA is another example. Student writing samples, class work, and oral reading indicated exceptionally low student spelling and vocabulary skills. Spellers were purchased and weekly spelling tests were initiated. Vocabulary emphasis was increased in E/LA classes and supported by "Vocabulary Across the Curriculum" in all classes. E/LA teachers use writing rubrics as teaching tools so students can prepare and analyze their own work as well as do peer evaluations. In Science, teachers noticed students struggling with rulers, and making predictions, etc. Science and math teachers increased class projects requiring these skills. Chapter review

tests, class discussions and student work indicated students were not retaining information. Students are now doing chapter summaries through written reflection with the use of a rubric. In Math, multiple measures showed "skill application" and abstract thinking areas of concern. Students now do journal writes and more hands-on, kinesthetic activities.

Indicators of Success - Communicating Student Performance/Assessment Data to All

Our major sources of data (API, AYP, etc.) are printed in local newspapers, district superintendent and school newsletters (mailed to every parent) and are included in our School Accountability Report Card (SARC) and Site Plan. The school newsletters and SARC are printed in Spanish and English. These documents are available in the office and are handed out at major events such as student-led conferences and Open House. An annual district "Test Evening" (in English and Spanish) is attended by parents and community members. Test results are shared and those attending are helped to understand how to interpret them. After this meeting, parents meet individually with site representatives from each school to discuss their children's individual results. Data is given and explained (in Spanish) at an annual English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC) meeting. Site Council members (including parents) thoroughly review data so they are able to share information with their peer groups. Through our homeroom G.O.A.L.S. program (Goals, Organization, Accountability And Learning System), teachers show students how to compare their 5th-8th grade data, analyze it, and share it with their parents. Each year they help ***each student develop an "individual learning plan"*** (ILP) by analyzing his/her own test scores and grades, creating personal goals and writing an action plan. The student shares the ILP, portfolios from every class, a Quality Student Assessment form, and first trimester report card with his/her parents at an individual student-led conference. **In three years only one parent/student has failed to attend this annual event.** Second and third trimester report cards are mailed home. The report card informs parents and students how students are progressing toward meeting promotion criteria and English/Language arts and standards (i.e. advanced, proficient, basic, below basic), each student's reading, writing, and math grade-level equivalencies, effort grades (class participation, planner checks, homework effort); annual community service project; attendance rate; after-school assistance attendance; and grades in PE, science, social studies, and art. Additional data is shared with students and parents through Student Study Team, 504, and Special Education IEP meetings, parent conferences, Title 1, EL, and G.A.T.E. meetings/letters.

Part IV – Indicators of Academic Success - Sharing Successes With Other Schools.

Although we will continue to share our successes with other schools, we have been doing such for several years. EMS is a member of the Yolo County Middle School Partnership. This group meets several times annually to share effective practices within our schools and discuss strategies to help us continue to improve student and school performance. Our county office brings us together in many arenas for this same purpose. For example, a new "History/Social Science" network brings together two teachers and the principal from every school in order to share knowledge and begin working toward the new state history social studies adoption. In an effort to share successes in a manner that creates opportunities for staff leadership, our staff presents at conferences and workshops. Four teachers and an aide did a presentation two years ago on our G.O.A.L.S. program at the Yolo County Striving For Excellence Program. Last year our Title 1/Reading teacher, RSP teacher, and RSP aide presented at the State Title 1 Achieving Schools conference (A System's Approach to Increase Student Achievement). Our principal and superintendent have been invited to present at a premiere state curriculum and instruction conference this February (How to Engage Staff, Students, and Parents In the Pursuit of Academic Excellence). Our two math teachers will do a presentation at the California League of Middle Schools state conference in March (How to Raise Student Math Achievement in High Poverty Schools), and a teacher and our principal have been invited to present at the North State Association of California School Administrators conference this coming May (Engaging Staff,

Parents, and Students in Pursuit of Academic Excellence in High Poverty Schools). We often host visitors from other schools throughout the area on our campus. We are happy to share our success and knowledge and to learn from others through our interactions.

Part V – Curriculum-Instruction Core; Engaged Students; Art/Foreign Language

MATH – Curriculum effectively moves students from development of basic number manipulation through measurement, geometry, patterns and functions to the abstractions of problem solving, logic and prediction. ALL students are heterogeneously grouped in grade level classes. Every 8th grader takes Algebra 1 (full year) or Algebra 1A, except those who go to EHS to take Geometry. Algebra 1A students take 1B at EHS the following year. Students are supported by EL/Sp Ed/migrant/Title 1 staff right in the classrooms except for temporary pullout support based on individual student need. Higher order thinking skills are developed through instructional techniques using prediction, strategy selection, evaluation, manipulatives, graphing calculators, math journals, etc. Students make geometric figures, charts and graphs, build bridges, and use technology and graphic organizers. They develop and analyze portfolios, respond to open-ended questions, peer teach via board-work, work in cooperative groups, and engage in partner-instructional conversations. This year a school chess tournament was implemented at lunch to help students develop their analytical/thinking skills. To help students move forward while still working on "gaps," support teachers reteach, review, and use the Accelerated Math program. Math support, a math class taken in addition to regular math by every student within the regular schedule gives students a chance to discuss their homework once they leave class, to review concepts that need more time to develop, and to go back and work on gaps. To increase math application skill acquisition, wood shop exploratory and cross-curricular project-based activities like designing and widening the school sidewalks are used.

E/LA– The curriculum offers a thinking, meaning-centered program that is balanced with support for all students. Every 6th grader takes a reading support class in addition to the regular language arts class within their regular day schedule. Accelerated Reader has helped improved reading skills for our best readers as much as it has for lower level readers. Literature sets that align with the state "California Readers List" are available in English and Spanish. Extended and recreational reading is encouraged through sustained silent reading and reading logs with written summaries. Listening and speaking are developed though drama, oral reports, poetry readings, brainstorming, cooperative grouping, and literature (fiction, non-fiction, drama, folk tales, multicultural literature and poetry). Writing focuses on conventions and rhetorical style. Writing prompts and rubrics are state aligned. Teachers use rubrics as teaching tools and for student self and peer evaluation. Students make personal poetry books sent to StudenTales for publishing and participate in contests such as the African-American essay contest. The local Valley Voice newspaper has featured EMS students in its Reading and Writing INK column. Students do journal writing in science, social studies and math, and take written tests in PE. Students do peer instruction, feedback and analysis of work through "tea party" pairs and computer book reports in which students present their book reports as power-point presentations. The reports are then shared by having each student shift computer stations until each one is read. Students use computers for writing and research.

SOCIAL STUDIES –Over three years, students study ancient, world, and state history and government. Students debate, use tangrams, make rice dolls, etc. to learn about various cultures and people. Teachers work together on thematic units like the 8th grade Blue and Grey Ball, which is a culminating activity to studying the Civil War period. Students write speeches, read period selections, and do re-enactments for this event. The community assists by helping students make their era, period costumes. A major goal of social studies is for students to expand their oral and written communications skills and to increase their reading comprehension and fluency.

SCIENCE – All students take science annually as a full year class. The courses of study cover earth, life and physical science. They use M& M and marshmallows to learn about the earth's core, metamorphic rock, and energy. They do labs, Web-Quest investigations, and dissections. They write chapter summaries in their journals, learn to take notes, and use technology skills to create a project for the annual science faire. Last fall, 8th graders prepared for a field trip to a County Supervisor's meeting by learning about environmental impact studies and air quality in science, how local government works in social studies, and the effects of asthma on their health in PE, as part of a community debate over whether or not to locate 3 asphalt manufacturing plants upwind from EMS.

ART – Art is taken by all 7th graders as a yearlong course and all 8th graders as a trimester exploratory class. Our community is arts-oriented, so students have opportunities to display art throughout the community, enjoy guest artists in class, and take field trips. Students study technique, history, cultural influence, famous artist, etc. They use computers for research and art design. A strong emphasis in placed on vocabulary and supporting academic core curriculum. Students take notes, do written journals and study various historical periods that are being studies in social science classes.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE – all 7th graders take Spanish as a one trimester exploratory class. Because many of our students are Spanish-speaking, the class is designed to not just teach non-Spanish students basic conversational Spanish, but is aimed at bringing students together—to appreciate one another's cultures, talents, history, and unique contributions. At first we offered the class to only non-Spanish speaking students but having all students take the class helps address cultural diversity and offers unique opportunities for classroom leadership skill development for our Spanish-speaking students.

Part V – Curriculum-Instruction; English Language Curriculum/Improving Reading.

We use a full inclusion model at EMS. This is possible because both our E/LA teachers speak fluent Spanish and all but 3 of our teachers have completed extensive SDAIE or CLAD/BCLAD certification. The others are currently taking training in order to meet the district mandates that all teachers must be certified by December 2004. All students are supported in the mainstream via our bilingual aides. Migrant students (with us April-0ctober annually) and students needing intensive assistance are scheduled into the ELD class one period where they are taught overwhelmingly in English with access to Spanish through the teacher and/or aide. The teacher develops her curriculum using the West Ed Map for Teaching & Assessing California's ELD & E/LA Standards for English Learners. This ensures complete alignment with the state ELD & E/LA standards. She uses a variety of "station" and whole group activities based on programs such as High Points, REWARDS, Language!, Compass Reading and Read Naturally. She addresses the learning styles and modalities of all students by having them interact with computers, audio equipments, peer groups, whole groups, one-on-one adult interaction, etc. Students needing ELD/Title 1 reading services are carefully scheduled so they receive direct assistance in "temporary" pullout situations.

Because 77% of our 6th graders enter EMS reading below grade level, all 6th graders receive a reading support class as part of their regular curriculum in addition to E/LA classes. This class is taught by our ELD/Title 1 reading teacher who works closely with the E/LA arts teachers using the state adopted text and materials aligned to the California Language Arts Standards. As part of the exploratory program every 6th grader gets one trimester of writing and every 7th grader one trimester of reading instruction (from the E/LA teachers) to help improve their skills. Additionally, identified Title 1 students receive after-school intervention in reading and/or are pulled out of their art/PE class for ½ period two days weekly for one trimester. Due to the block schedule, regular E/LA teachers provide opportunities for Sustained Silent Reading and Accelerated Reader for all students during regular class instruction. Teachers have just implemented the Accelerated Vocabulary program this year to support their regular programs and

our school Vocabulary Across the Curriculum efforts. A late bus helps us provide four classes each trimester after school in reading and language development.

Part V – Curriculum-Instruction; One Other Curricular Area – Physical Education

Physical education is important to our program not only because of the positive impact it has on children's physical, emotional, and social development, but because of the academic support it provides to our core curriculum. The physical education curriculum is sequential from grades six through eight. It is aligned to the state physical education frameworks and challenge standards. The goals of physical education are to increase movement skills and knowledge; enhance self-image and personal development; improve social development; improve physical health, including learning how to live a healthy lifestyle; and expand academic skills with emphasis on integrated learning to include oral skills, spoken and written vocabulary, math application, history, social science, health, science, and performing arts.

Students learn team-building and cooperative skills as well as how to create lessons to teach to their peers. Students take written tests, learn to spell muscles and bones, study vocabulary, do writing assignments, and study history in conjunction with their academic learning. For example, students are currently getting ready for the Blue and Grey Ball (see social studies). Since all of our physical education classes are co-ed, students not only learn to waltz, grand march and Virginia Reel together, but they learn and demonstrate proper dance etiquette, social graces, acceptance, and proper elegant dress as well.

It is in this program students discuss health related issues. Eighth graders spend PE time learning about asthma as part of their study on the effect of asphalt plants being built in our community. Outside resources and agencies are used to assist in this type of learning. Our local sheriff and highway patrol officers conduct our D.A.R.E. and Tolerance programs. County agencies provide Sexual Harassment/Abuse and Family Life educational programs.

Test results prove EMS students are becoming physically fit. The State Superintendent of Instruction announced that the 2003 state physical fitness scores are alarming (state tests in grades 5, 7, & 9). But this is not the case at EMS. The percent of students meeting the six fitness standards by scoring in the healthy fitness zone on the six fitness standards are: all six, EMS 54%; State 27%; five of six, EMS 82.9%. EMS shows both boys and girls scoring about the same. There were no EMS students scoring in the 0-1 standards met range. Physical education allows us to meet many parts of our mission and vision.

Part V – Curriculum-Instruction; Differential Instructional Methods

In 2002-03 the entire district received training in differentiated instructional methods. Because all students are mainstreamed, it is essential that we meet the needs of all students within the classroom. The adoption of the most current state textbooks have helped EMS teachers in this endeavor as the new textbooks do a better job of providing ideas, strategies, and materials for differentiating instruction. In math, for example, the "Key to Algebra" workbook allows students to work at a slower pace with more examples and problems available readily in class and at home. The workbook is consumable so the child can take it from the regular to support class and home easily. Work assignments are altered for various student needs. Within one assignment, students can be challenged with more open-ended questions while the assignment is "modified" for a student who is still having trouble with the concept. Journals allow students to either show their knowledge by writing an example or, for more challenge, by having to write a paragraph response. In science, teachers have students "take notes" in different manners. The more capable students must put their notes in outline form while students needing more assistance may fill in blanks that he provides on an overhead. Students have choices for obtaining information. They can use a notebook, pictograph or graphic organizer. Teachers give a copy of their "overhead notes" to students who need them after the lesson is over. Students are assigned "buddies" to help as well. Students work with

computers in all classes and have choices on how to obtain information and demonstrate knowledge. Rubrics, peer teaching, tea party groups, etc. are used in all classes. The use of "stations", or having students do multiple tasks (addressing different modalities), within a class period is effective and motivating for our students. Students are often grouped for labs that allow all students to be successful. All teachers use overhead projectors for instruction and the day's objective is written on the board. The art teacher had four different methods for delivering her instruction last week. The information was on the board, on her computer, on the TV monitor overhead, and on the note-taking guide. It was interesting watching students adapt to the different options in order to take down the information. Some students did it through her verbal instruction and then checked it after they were done. Others wrote as she wrote on the board. Still others looked at the computer or TV screen. In the end they all got the information written down successfully. The support staff (RSP, ELD, etc.) often provides student books on tape, helps students take verbal, instead of written tests, provides additional instruction, etc.

Part V – Curriculum-Instruction; Professional Development & It's Effectiveness

Our staff development is focused and aligns with goals that are determined by assessment data. Most of our training over the last three years has been on how to improve curriculum and instruction and use data in order to improve student achievement. The assessment results shared throughout this application are testimony to the fruits of this labor. We find "team training" to be most effective. For example: Surveys and observations showed students were not using enough technology. **So, five teachers and the principal took Project Connect—a 120-hour weekend, summer project with students—that focused on using technology to teach content area standards.** All teachers and students are now using technology. Our 12 teachers average 70+ hours and our classified employees 12+ hours of staff development per person annually. Additionally, five teachers are taking college classes. Two math teachers took 40 hours of training to learn how to create lessons and deliver instruction using the new textbook as a resource. In the 2002-03 school year, the following staff development occurred: *2 full-day in-services: "How To Interpret and Use Data To Develop Standards-Based Lessons" and Differentiated Instruction; *4 after-school series: The topics for each 2-hour, 4-day series were: Technology Integration and Raising Student Achievement; * 4 district common plan days: EMS/EHS continued alignment and articulation work which led to standards-based courses of study in every content area, better assessment tools, alignments of classes and a direct increase in our math results. Additionally, all new teachers in our district are part of the state Beginning Teacher Support and Assistance Program (BTSA) which provides each teacher with a veteran teacher as a support provider. We've given example of how performance has improved. The following are examples of how staff development was determined and used in order to obtain those results:

Workshops – Data: 77% of 6th graders enter EMS reading below grade level; 37% 3 years or more. Response: E/LA-ELD teachers--Reading Strategies & EL students, Read Naturally; Compass Reading; Reading Intervention Strategies; Accelerated Reader. Data: math application skills low. Response: MSDP & CLMS conferences; CPM Strategies; Calculator For Learning; Standards-Based Math Strategies. Data: Healthy Kids Survey and loss of health services. Response: PE teacher—Health and Youth Development in Schools to revise health and development curriculum. Data: Writing score average "2" Response: E/LA teachers took Writer Workshop; social studies teacher--UCD History Project. Science/Math 3 year MSDP grant allowed all teachers to develop standards, adopt texts, develop curriculum and assessments, take training in each of these areas and work with a coach (classroom observations, collegial discussion and feed back). Data: less than 2% students in top quartile; Response: Roger Taylor G.A.T.E.; Algebra Strategies, Digital Cameras; Project-Based Learning. Data: Students reading scores not rising as fast as math; Response: All E/LA, SP Ed & Title 1 teachers trained in Accelerated Reader. Data: Content cluster show student gaps but still wanting to maintain higher math level expectations. Response: Math teachers trained in Accelerated Math as another tool in the support class.

Part VI – Private School Addendum – N/A
Part VII – Assessment Results – See attached pages

All EMS students are tested in April annually through the California Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program which includes the California Standards Tests (CST) in English-language arts and mathematics in grades
6-8 and a norm-referenced test (NRT) called the California Achievement Test, 6th Edition (CAT6). The CAT6 replaced the Stanford Achievement Test, 9th Edition (SAT9) in 2002-03. The CST English-language arts test was implemented in 2000-2001 and the mathematics tests began in 2001-02; therefore data is available for 3 years in E/LA and 2 years in math. The CRT determines how well students are meeting the state content standards. Students must score advanced or proficient on the CST tests to meet state standards. The state does not report scores when a subgroup is too small to produce a valid result; therefore, those groups are not listed in this data. **Except for 1 or 2 parents exemptions annually, every student at EMS takes all the tests. No groups of students are excluded from any tests.** The state does allow severely handicapped students (Downs Syndrome, etc.) to take CAPA (California Alternative Performance Assessment) in lieu of the CST tests. Five 8th graders qualified for CAPA in 2003 which explains a slightly lower percentage of students tested on the 8th grade CST in 2003. The 8th grade CST is "course specific." Students take the test for the course they are expected to complete at the end of their 8th grade year. Algebra is the state 8th grade level course; therefore students who do not complete algebra by year's end take the 8th grade general math test which tests 6th & 7th grade, not 8th grade, standards. EMS students taking this test are those enrolled in a two-year (Algebra 1A and Algebra 1B) course of study. No EMS students qualified to take the algebra or geometry tests in 2002; therefore no scores are noted. Only students who complete algebra as a one-year course (Algebra 1) take the algebra test. Scores are not available for any range (basic, below, etc.) other than at/above proficient in the subcategories sub at economically disadvantaged.

Students must score at/above proficient to meet the California content standards. Numbers are rounded to nearest tenth so some figures will total above/below 100%. No groups were eliminated from any tests in any year(s). 100% of students were tested in each year shown. 5 CAPA students were tested in 2003. All levels (advanced, basic, etc.) are not by the state for all subcategories (such as economically disadvantaged). In some years tests were not administered by the state or data was not reported in a particular format. These situations are noted in each table.

CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST	**General Math**		**Algebra**		**Geometry**	
GRADE 8 MATH – APRIL, 2003	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	State
% Of Students At Advanced	2	3	0	10	50	32
% of Students At/Above Proficient	38	24	36	39	100	74
% of Students At/Above Basic	74	56	91	67	100	93
% of Students At/Above Below Basic	90	84	100	91	100	100
% of Students At/Above Far Below Basic	101	100	100	100	100	100
Number of Students In Grade	68	-	68	-	68	-
Number of Students Scores	46	-	11	-	6	-
1. Economically Disadvantaged						
% of Students At/Above Proficient	39	14	0	22	100	50
Number of Student Scores	24	-	4	-	2	-
2. Non –Economically Disadvantaged						
% of Students At/Above Proficient	36	34	57	47	100	79
Number of Student Scores	34	-	7	-	3	-
3. Hispanic or Latino						
% of Students At/Above Proficient	35	14	0	20	100	
Number of Student Scores	27	-	4	-	1	
4. White (non Hispanic)						
% of Students At/Above Proficient	47	37	57	49	100	79
Number of Student Scores	17	-	7	-	5	-

CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TESTS	**General Math**		**Algebra**	**Geometry**
GRADE 8 MATH – APRIL, 2002	EMS	State		
% of Students At Advanced	13	2		
% of Students At/Above Proficient	46	20		
% of Students At/Above Basic	77	54	No EMS students took the algebra or geometry tests in 2002; scores for Hispanic or Latino not available 2002.	
% of Students At/Above Below Basic	97	87		
% of Students At/Above Far Below Basic	101	100		
Number of Students in Grade	59			
Number of Student Scores	55	-		
1. Economically Disadvantaged				
% of Students At/Above Proficient	36	12		
Number of Students Tested	25	-		
2. Non –Economically Disadvantaged				
% of Students At/Above Proficient	53	29		
Number of Student Scores	30	-		

CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST						
GRADE 8 ENGLISH/LANG ARTS	2002-2003		2001-2002		2000-2001	
School/State Scores - All Students	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	State
% of Students At Advanced	11	8	4	10	3	9
% of Students At/Above Proficient	42	30	34	32	13	32
% of Students At/Above Basic	78	64	77	66	53	67
% of Students At/Above Below Basic	91	84	91	85	81	86
% of Students At/Above Far Below Basic	100	99	100	99	100	100
Number of Students in Grade	68	-	59	-	78	-
Number of Student Tested	64	-	56	-	78	-
1. Economically Disadvantaged						
% of Students At/Above Proficient	27	15	28	14	8	14
Number of Students Scores	30	-	25	-	48	-
2. Non –Economically Disadvantaged						
% of Students At/Above Proficient	56	43	38	46	20	45
Number of Students Scores	34	-	31	-	30	-
3. Hispanic or Latino			These subgroups were not reported for the 2000-01 & 2001-02 testing. The subgroups listed in this entire table are the only ones with significant numbers to be considered valid. Only at/above proficient scores are available from state for subgroups listed.			
% of Students At/Above Proficient	29	15				
Number of Student Scores	31	-				
4. White (not Hispanic)						
% of Students At/Above Proficient	55	35				
Number of Student Scores	29	-				

CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST						
GRADE 7 – ENGLISH/LANG ARTS	2002-2003		2001-2002		2000-2001	
School Scores - All Students	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	State
% of Students At Advanced	7	10	7	7	2	9
% of Students At/Above Proficient	36	36	30	33	22	32
% of Students At/Above Basic	69	69	78	65	70	65
% of Students At/Above Below Basic	83	87	97	85	85	86
% of Students At/Above Far Below Basic	100	101	100	100	101	101
Number of Students in Grade	70	-	73	-	67	-
Number of Students Tested	69	-	71		67	88
1. Economically Disadvantaged						
% of Students At/Above Proficient	18	19	19	16	12	14
Number of Student Scores	34	-	32	-	34	-
2. Non –Economically Disadvantaged						
% of Students At/Above Proficient	53	51	41	48	34	45
Number of Student Scores	36	-	37	-	27	-
3. Hispanic or Latino			These subgroups were not reported for the 2000-01 & 2001-02 testing. The subgroups listed in this entire table are the only ones with significant numbers to be considered valid. Only at/above proficient scores are available from state for subgroups listed.			
% of Students At/Above Proficient	16	20				
Number of Student Scores	31	-				
4. White (not Hispanic)						
% of Students At/Above Proficient	51	54				
Number of Student Scores	35	-				

CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST						
GRADE 7 – MATHEMATICS	2002-2003		2001-2002		2000-2001	
School/State Scores - All Students	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	State
% of Students Advanced	4	7	10	6	Scores not reported in this manner during this year in math	
% of Students At/Above Proficient	35	30	39	30		
% of Students At/Above Basic	64	62	75	61		
% of Students At/Above Below Basic	91	88	100	89		
% of Students At/Above Far Below Basic	100	100	101	100		
Number of Students in Grade	70	-	73	-		
Number of Students Tested	69	-	70	-		
School/State Schools - Subgroups						
1. Economically Disadvantaged					This information was not given for the 2000-01 state standards testing in math	
% of Students At/Above Proficient	26	16	35	16		
Number of Student Scores	34	-	34	-		
2. Non –Economically Disadvantaged						
% of Students At/Above Proficient	44	43	41	48		
Number of Student Scores	36	-	39	-		
3. Subgroup: Hispanic or Latino			These subgroups were not reported for the 2000-01 & 2001-02 testing. The subgroups listed in this entire table are the only ones with significant numbers to be considered valid. Only at/above proficient scores are available from state for subgroups listed.			
% of Student At/Above Proficient	23	16				
Number of Student Scores	31	-				
4. Subgroup: White (not Hispanic)						
% of Student At/Above Proficient	46	34				
Number of Student Scores	35	-				

CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST						
GRADE 6 – ENGLISH/LANG ARTS	2002-2003		2001-2002		2000-2001	
School/State Scores - All Students	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	State
% of Students At Advanced	3	13	1	9	7	8
% of Students At/Above Proficient	28	36	16	30	20	31
% of Students At/Above Basic	63	71	49	66	61	67
% of Students At/Above Below Basic	85	87	76	85	88	87
% of Students At/Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	100	101	100
Number of Students in Grade	68	-	67	-	71	-
Number of Students Tested	68	-	66	-	71	-
School/State Scores - Subgroups						
1. Economically Disadvantaged						
% of Student At/Above Proficient	14	23	6	14	6	14
Number of Student Scores	43	-	36	-	31	-
2. Non –Economically Disadvantaged						
% of Students At/Above Proficient	52	54	30	47	31	48
Number of Student Scores	25	-	30	-	40	-
3. Subgroup: Hispanic or Latino			These subgroups were not reported for the 2000-01 & 2001-02 testing. The subgroups listed in this entire table are the only ones with significant numbers to be considered valid. Only at/above proficient scores are available from state for subgroups listed.			
% of Students At/Above Proficient	21	19				
Number of Student Scores	43	-				
4. Subgroup: White (not Hispanic)						
% of Students At/Above Proficient	39	56				
Number of Student Scores	23	-				

CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST			
GRADE 6 – MATHEMATICS	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001

School/State Scores - All Students	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	State
% of Students At Advanced	4	10	6	10	Scores not reported in this manner during this year in math	
% of Students At/Above Proficient	29	34	27	32		
% of Students At/Above Basic	57	64	49	62		
% of Students At/Above Below Basic	94	92	91	91		
% of Students At/Above Far Below Basic	98	100	100	100		
Number of Students in Grade	68	-	67	-		
Number of Students Tested	67	-	66	-		
School/State Scores - Subgroups						
1. Economically Disadvantaged					Information in this subcategory was given only for students at/above proficient and not for categories below	
% of Students At/Above Proficient	28	19	17	19		
Number of Student Scores	43	-	37	-		
2. Non –Economically Disadvantaged						
% of Students At/Above Proficient	33	51	41	48		
Number of Student Scores	24	-	29	-		
3. Subgroup: Hispanic or Latino			These subgroups were not reported for the 2000-01 & 2001-02 testing. The subgroups listed in this entire table are the only ones with significant numbers to be considered valid. Only at/above proficient scores are available from state for subgroups listed.			
% of Students At/Above Proficient	24	19				
Number of Student Scores	42	-				
4. Subgroup: White (not Hispanic)						
% of Students At/Above Proficient	43	52				
Number of Student Scores	23	-				

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST (2002-03) STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST (1999-2002)								
GRADE 8-READING-CAT6/SAT9	2002-2003		2001-2002		2000-2001		2000	1999
School/State Scores – All students	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	EMS
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	57	40	58	48	39	48	47	25
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	22	24	26	21	8	21	17	7
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	54	50	68	49	39	50	55	22
Mean Scaled Score	684	671	698	688	680	688	687	664
Number of Students in Grade	68	-	59	-	78	-	57	69
# of Students Tested (5 CAPA)*	63*	-	56	-	76	-	53	64
1. Economically Disadvantaged								
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	51	25	46	32	35	32	38	21
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	14	6	10	8	4	8	8	0
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	48	23	48	30	33	39	52	15
Number of Student Scores	29	-	21	-	45	-	25	39
2. Non-Economically Disadvantaged								
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	63	54	67	60	45	60	54	32
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	29	24	38	31	14	31	25	17
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	59	54	85	64	48	65	57	31
Number of Student Scores	34	-	26	-	29	-	28	-
3. Hispanic or Latino CAT6			This subgroup was not reported on the SAT9					
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	49	25						
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	17	6						
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	43	23						
Number of Student Scores	30	-						
4. White (not Hispanic)			*English Only-Fluent English Speaking*					
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	68	58	64	55	44	56	54	29
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	31	28	28	26	9	26	20	9
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	69	60	74	59	45	59	63	25
Number of Students Scores	29	-	43	-	65	-	46	56

GRADE 8 – MATH - CAT6/SAT9	2002-2003		2001-2002		2000-2001		2000	1999
School/State Scores – All students	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	EMS
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	67	43	68	52	39	51	44	25

% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	32	22	36	25	8	25	12	7
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	69	48	79	50	31	49	44	22
Mean Scaled Score	708	681	699	684	670	683	674	664
Number of Student Scores	62	-	47	-	74	-	52	68
1. Economically Disadvantaged								
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	58	28	61	37	39	36	41	23
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	28	11	33	11	7	10	8	3
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	66	32	71	32	27	31	46	10
Number of Student Scores	29	-	21	-	45	-	24	40
2. Non-Economically Disadvantaged								
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	74	56	67	60	40	63	47	31
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	36	32	38	31	10	35	14	4
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	73	61	85	64	38	62	43	29
Number of Student Scores	33	-	26	-	29	-	28	38
3. Hispanic or Latino			This subgroup was not reported on the SAT9					
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	55	28						
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	20	10						
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	53	32						
Number of Student Scores	30	-						
4. White (not Hispanic)			*English Only/Fluent English Speaking*					
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	79	60	64	55	40	57	46	27
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	45	34	28	26	8	29	48	4
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	86	65	74	59	34	56	13	18
Number of Student Scores	29	-	43	-	65	-	46	56

GRADE 7-READING-CAT6/SAT9	2002-2003		2001-2002		2000-2001		1999-2000		1999
School/State Scores – All students	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	52	40	54	46	35	46	32	45	36
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	24	21	17	24	11	24	6	23	11
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	54	45	54	48	43	48	24	46	33
Mean Scaled Score	669	658	684	676	666	676	661	674	665
Number of Student In Grade	71		73		67		79		54
Number of Student Scores	70	-	63	-	61	-	79	-	54
1. Economically Disadvantaged									
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	37	25	46	29	23	29	26	27	29
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	12	9	14	9	6	9	4	8	7
# of Students At/Above 50th NRP	41	28	48	28	26	28	18	26	24
Number of Student Scores	34	-	29	-	34	-	51	-	29
2. Non-Economically Disadvantaged									
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	65	57	60	61	53	61	45	60	45
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	36	33	21	36	19	36	11	35	16
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	67	60	59	64	63	64	36	63	44
Number of Student Scores	36	-	34	-	27	-	28	-	49
3. Hispanic or Latino			This subgroup was not reported on the SAT9						
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	33	26							
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	10	9							
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	35	28							
Number of Student Scores	31	-							
4. White (not Hispanic)			*English Only/Fluent English Proficient*						
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	67	62	58	55	44	55	39	54	41
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	37	37	19	29	13	29	8	28	12
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	71	65	58	57	49	57	29	79	37
Number of Student Scores	35	-	58	-	53	-	66	-	49

GRADE 7 – MATH - CAT6/SAT9	2002-2003		2001-2002		2000-2001		1999-2000		1999
School/State Scores – All students	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	48	42	65	54	44	53	30	51	34

% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	22	22	32	28	16	27	8	25	7
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	45	46	60	52	43	50	25	48	33
Mean Scaled Score	673	666	686	677	666	675	652	673	657
Number of Student Scores	69	-	62	-	61	-	79	-	54
1. Economically Disadvantaged									
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	36	28	46	29	37	37	28	34	31
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	12	10	14	9	12	13	4	11	3
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	32	30	48	28	35	33	21	30	24
Number of Student Scores	34	-	29	-	34	-	52	-	29
2. Non-Economically Disadvantaged									
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	60	58	60	61	53	66	35	65	38
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	31	32	21	36	22	39	14	37	12
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	57	61	59	64	52	65	32	63	44
Number of Student Scores	35	-	34	-	27	-	28	-	25
3. Hispanic or Latino									
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	35	28							
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	13	10							
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	35	30							
Number of Student Scores	31	-							
Percent of total students tested		-							
4. White (not Hispanic)			*English Only/Fluent English Proficient*						
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	57	61	58	55	49	60	39	54	36
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	26	34	19	29	19	32	8	28	8
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	49	65	58	57	49	58	29	79	37
Number of Student Scores	35	-	58	-	53	-	66	-	49

This subgroup was not Reported on the SAT9

GRADE 6-READING-CAT6/SAT9	2002-2003		2001-2002		2000-2001		1999-2000		1999
School/State Scores – All students	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	41	39	41	49	43	48	33	47	23
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	15	18	13	24	12	24	5	23	2
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	37	45	35	48	38	47	28	46	16
Mean Scaled Score	651	649	654	62	656	660	646	660	635
Number of Students in Grade	68		67		71		63		82
Number of Student Scores	68	-	55	-	68	-	58	-	81
1. Economically Disadvantaged									
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	30	26	31	33	33	32	28	30	21
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	9	8	4	10	3	9	3	9	0
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	26	30	19	29	24	28	25	26	10
Number of Student Scores	43	-	27	-	29	-	36	-	48
2. Non-Economically Disadvantaged									
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	62	56	51	65	51	64	42	63	28
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	24	30	22	39	18	38	9	37	6
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	56	62	52	67	49	66	32	65	24
Number of Student Scores	25	-	27	-	39	-	22	-	33
3. Hispanic or Latino									
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	31	26							
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	7	8							
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	23	30							
Number of Students Scores	43	-							
4. White (not Hispanic)			*English Only/ Fluent English Proficient*						
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	58	57	44	8	47	57	39	56	26
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	30	31	12	0	13	30	6	29	3
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	61	64	37	8	43	57	33	56	19
Number of Students Scores	23	-	44	-	47	-	49	-	70

This subgroup was not reported on the SAT9

GRADE 6 – MATH - CAT6/SAT9	2002-2003		2001-2002		2000-2001		1999-2000		1999
School/State Scores – All students	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS	State	EMS
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	40	44	57	62	54	60	43	57	27

% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	15	26	32	38	25	35	22	32	6
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	43	51	50	60	46	57	48	55	17
Mean Scaled Score	657	661	665	671	662	668	650	665	633
Number of Student Scores	68	-	56	-	67	-	58	-	81
1. Economically Disadvantaged									
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	34	29	31	33	44	44	34	40	25
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	9	14	4	10	14	19	14	16	12
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	33	37	19	29	36	41	36	62	10
Number of Student Scores	43	29	27	-	28	-	36	-	49
2. Non-Economically Disadvantaged									
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	54	64	51	65	62	74	42	72	30
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	24	40	22	39	33	51	9	48	9
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	60	67	52	67	54	73	32	72	24
Number of Student Scores	25	-	27	-	39	-	22	-	33
3. Hispanic or Latino			This subgroup was not reported on the SAT9						
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	33	29							
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	9	14							
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	35	36							
Number of Students Scores	43	-							
4. White (not Hispanic)			*English Only/Fluent English Proficient*						
Total NPR for "Avg" student score	56	65	44	58	58	67	49	64	28
% of Students At/Above 75th NRP	26	40	12	30	28	42	27	39	6
% of Students At/Above 50th NRP	57	68	37	58	52	65	57	81	19
Number of Student Scores	23	-	44	-	60	-	49	-	70